

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendment in the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-28 are presently pending in this case. Claims 1, 17, 23, 27, and 28 are amended by the present amendment. As amended Claims 1, 17, 23, 27, and 28 are supported by the original disclosure,<sup>1</sup> no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Shambroom (U.S. Patent No. 5,923,756).

The outstanding rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 1 recites in part:

said authenticating means provides ***device identification data identifying the device to be authenticated and service identification data*** to said key generating means, ***said service identification data including first data corresponding to a first service to be received by a user of the device to be authenticated and second data corresponding to a second service to be received by the user of the device to be authenticated***, and said key generating means generates said key data by using only one of said first data or said second data from among said first data and said second data received from said authenticating means.

The outstanding Office Action cited a username and password of Shambroom as “first data and second data” as recited in Claim 1.<sup>2</sup> However, it is respectfully submitted that neither the username nor the password of Shambroom are “service identification data” as recited in amended Claim 1, as neither corresponds to a service to be received by a user of a device to be authenticated. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Shambroom does not appear to describe that device identification data ***and*** service identification data are sent to a key generating means. Therefore, Shambroom does not teach “authentication means” and

---

<sup>1</sup>See, e.g., the specification at page 13, lines 9-22.

<sup>2</sup>See the outstanding Office Action at page 2, lines 20-22.

“key generating means” as defined in amended Claim 1. Consequently, Claim 1 (and Claims 2-16 dependent therefrom) is not anticipated by Shambroom and is patentable thereover.

Amended Claims 17 and 23 recite in part “receiving from said authenticating means ***device identification data identifying the device to be authenticated and service identification data*** at said key generating means, ***said service identification data including first data corresponding to a first service to be received by a user of the device to be authenticated and second data corresponding to a second service to be received by the user of the device to be authenticated.***”

As noted above, Shambroom only appears to describe that a username and password are sent from a web browser 620 to a web server 720. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Shambroom does not teach receiving device identification data ***and*** service verification data, the service identification data including first data corresponding to a first service and second data corresponding to a second service. Therefore, Shambroom does not teach “receiving” as defined in amended Claims 17 and 23. Consequently, Claims 17 and 23 (and Claims 18-22 and 24-26 dependent therefrom) are not anticipated by Shambroom and are patentable thereover.

Amended Claim 27 recites in part:

said authenticating circuit provides device identification data identifying the device to be authenticated ***and*** service identification data to said key generating circuit, ***said service identification data including first data corresponding to a first service to be received by a user of the device to be authenticated and second data corresponding to a second service to be received by the user of the device to be authenticated,*** and said key generating circuit generates said key data by using only one of said first data or said second data from among said first data and said second data received from said authenticating circuit.

Again, Shambroom only appears to describe that a username and password are sent from a web browser 620 to a web server 720. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that

Shambroom does not teach an authentication circuit that provides device identification data and service identification data to a key generating circuit, the service identification data including first data corresponding to a first service and second data corresponding to a second service. Therefore, Shambroom does not teach “an authenticating circuit” and “a key generating circuit” as defined in amended Claim 27. Consequently, Claim 27 is not anticipated by Shambroom and is patentable thereover.

Amended Claim 28 recites in part:

said authenticating unit is configured to provide device identification data identifying the device to be authenticated **and** service identification data to said key generating unit, **said service identification data including first data corresponding to a first service to be received by a user of the device to be authenticated and second data corresponding to a second service to be received by the user of the device to be authenticated**, and said key generating unit is configured to generate said key data by using only one of said first data or said second data from among said first data and said second data received from said authenticating unit.

As Shambroom only appears to describe that a username and password are sent from a web browser 620 to a web server 720, it is respectfully submitted that Shambroom does not teach an authentication unit configured to provide device identification data and service identification data to a key generating unit, the service identification data including first data corresponding to a first service and second data corresponding to a second service. Therefore, Shambroom does not teach “an authenticating unit” and “a key generating unit” as defined in amended Claim 28. Consequently, amended Claim 28 is not anticipated by Shambroom and is patentable thereover.

Application No. 10/791,760  
Reply to Office Action of November 13, 2007

Accordingly, the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance.

An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

*Edward Tracy*

Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Edward W. Tracy, Jr.  
Registration No. 47,998

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)

I:\ATTY\ET\249943US\249943US-AMD3.13.08.DOC